



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11/18

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,090	07/08/2003	Douglas M. Baney	10020766-1	9657

7590 09/06/2006  
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Legal Department, DL 429  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 7599  
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

CHIAM, DINH D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2883

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/616,090	BANEY, DOUGAS M.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Erin D. Chiem	2883	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>5/31/06</u> |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)                                 |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on June 13, 2006. Currently claims 1-10 are pending. Attached in the current office action is an Interview Summary regarding the telephonic communication with Ms. Cheryl Eichstaedt on August 31, 2006.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bjarklev et al. (US 6,972,894 B2) hereinafter “Bjarklev.”


Claim 1: Bjarklev discloses in Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9 an optical waveguide absorption cell (Fig. 9), comprising: a first wave-guide (92); a primary core (41) including a holey waveguide (94) filled with a known selective absorption medium (col. 5, lines 30-36), wherein a first terminus of said holey wave-guide (94) is coupled to a first terminus of said first wave-guide; and a secondary core including said primary core; and a second wave-guide (93), wherein a first terminus of said second waveguide is coupled to a second terminus of said holey waveguide.

Claim 4: The holey waveguide comprises a core (11); and a plurality of voids formed in said primary core (12) (See for example Fig. 1). Also please see Fig. 4 and column 14

line 64 to column 15 line 30 for Bjarklev's disclosure of the preferred embodiment in which the elements (40 and 42) are voids.

**Fig. 4**

Bjarlev et



Claim 6: With regard to the limitation wherein the waveguide absorption cell comprises of a first waveguide cable, a holey waveguide cable, and a second waveguide cable is clearly understood as an inference feature in Bjarklev disclosure of a device used in high capacity transmission system (See Background of the Invention).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***


The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjarklev in view of Russell et al. (US 6,631,234 B1) hereinafter "Russell."

Bjarklev discloses in Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9 an optical waveguide absorption cell (Fig. 9), comprising: a first wave-guide ((92); a holey waveguide (94) filled with a known selective absorption medium (col. 5, lines 30-36), wherein a first terminus of said holey waveguide (94) is coupled to a first terminus of said first waveguide; and a second waveguide (93), wherein a first terminus of said second waveguide is coupled to a second terminus of said holey waveguide.

**Fig. 1**



**Fig. 9**



However Bjarklev does not explicitly disclose the first terminus of said holey waveguide is coupled to the first terminus of the first waveguide utilizing a fusion splice (claim 2) or a light-transmitting adhesive (claim 3).

Russell discloses fusion splicing a standard waveguide with a holey waveguide by means of fusion splicing and the conventional adhesive (See col. 3, lines 33-50) for the purpose of coupling a standard waveguide with a holey waveguide and maintains the fundamental mode.

Since Bjarklev and Russell are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Russell would have been recognized in the pertinent art or Bjarklev.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to recognize the fusion splicing technique or using an adhesive as disclosed by Russell would be applicable in the manufacturing of the absorption cell of Bjarklev.

**The motivation** for employing fusion splicing or adhesive as the coupling means in the absorption cell is to improve coupling efficiency at the coupled points.

Claims 5, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjarklev in view of Levenson (US 6,496,634 B1) hereinafter "Levenson."

Bjarklev discloses in Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9 an optical waveguide absorption cell (Fig. 9), comprising: a primary core; a secondary core that includes said primary core; a plurality of voids formed in said primary core a first wave-guide ((92); a holey waveguide (94) filled with a known selective absorption medium (col. 5, lines 30-36), wherein a first terminus of said holey waveguide (94) is coupled to a first terminus of said first waveguide; and a second waveguide (93), wherein a first terminus of said second waveguide is coupled to a second terminus of said

Art Unit: 2883


holey waveguide. The holey waveguide comprises a core (11); and a plurality of voids formed in said core (12) (See for example Fig. 1).

Claim 9: Bjarklev discloses a light source is adapted to couple with the holey waveguide (81).

Claim 10: Bjarklev incorporated the disclosure of Stubkjaer et al. teaching a wavelength opto-electronic converter comprising of a detector (col. 1, line 29).

However, Bjarklev does not disclose the holey waveguide further comprises a fill hole formed in the core, wherein the fill hole is an opening in the core that is not at the first terminus of the holey waveguide and is not at the second terminus of the holey waveguide, the fill hole adapted to introduce the known selective absorption medium into the plurality of voids.

Levenson discloses the method of filling the holey waveguide with the known selective absorption medium through capillary action from the holes in the cladding (Fig. 9 and col. 4, lines 1-6) for the purpose of controlling the refractive index of the waveguide.



Since Bjarklev and Levenson are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Levenson would have been recognized in the pertinent art or Bjarklev.

Art Unit: 2883


It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to recognize the filling technique through capillary action, as disclosed by Levenson, would be applicable in the manufacturing of the absorption cell of Bjarklev. The motivation for employing the filling method as taught by Levenson by immersing the holey waveguide in a gas or liquid and allows the medium to absorb into the holes through capillary action is a cost effective method versus, for example, vacuum impregnation.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's ONLY substantial argument is Bjarklev, alone or in combination, does not teach the amended limitation of a "primary core" and a "secondary core included said primary core."

In the communication with applicant's representative, Ms. Cheryl Eichstaedt, the support for these amended limitations can be found in Fig. 2B and Specification on page 8 line 19 to page 9 line 5. However, applicant is silent on the inquiry regarding whether the limitation is a





Art Unit: 2883

structural limitation or a linguistic limitation. Since applicant is silent on the issue, Examiner relies upon the Specification and Fig. 2B for clarification. As it appears in Fig. 2B applicant is his/her own lexicographer and the “a secondary core including said primary core” is a linguistic differentiation since Fig. 2B shows the primary core (250) and the secondary core (255) is the same structural feature. Furthermore, the Specification on page 8 line 19 to page 9 line 5 is silent on how the two different “cores” functions differently.

Applicant also has a second argument on page 4 of the Remarks starting at the 4th paragraph to page 5. Examiner is uncertain what applicant is attempting to compare and contrast by quoting various portions of Barkley’s disclosures and finally asserting that Bjarklev teaches away from “an optical wave-guide absorption cell” as recited by claim 1. Examiner respectfully points out claim 1 does not claim any of the following features:

- Optical light sources
- Refractive index
- Leaky modes
- Waveguide cladding

Since Bjarklev teaches the structural limitations of claim 1, Examiner is uncertain what applicant is trying to compare and contrast when claim 1 does not claim any of the above features.

*Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin D. Chiem whose telephone number is (571) 272-3102. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9AM - 5PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G. Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2883

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Erin D Chiem  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2883



Frank G. Font  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2800